



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,819	12/30/2005	Regis Houze	0600-1054	6555
466	7590	10/24/2008	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			ABU ALI, SHUANQYI	
209 Madison Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 500			1793	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/24/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/562,819	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HOUZE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SHUANGYI ABU ALI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 18-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 18-41 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/30/2005

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Objections***

Claim 23 objected to because of the following informalities: please change p1-1 to pH. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 31-33 and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 31-33 and 36-41 provide for the use of additive but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 18-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/96403 to Du Bourg et al.

This rejection is over the WO 01/96403 because the reference qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S. U. 102 (b). However, for convenience, the paragraph and line numbers of the English language equivalent U. S. Patent Application No. 2004/0112559 will be cited below.

Regarding claims 18-24, Du Bourg et al. disclose a starch composition comprising a DM in the range of 10-50%, a fixed nitrogen level at a range of 0.2-1.5%, a viscosity of 5-1500 mPa.s, and a pH in the range of 4-8.5. ([0058], [0060], [0062], [0050], [0111], [0114], [0116], Example 1-11).

The references differ from Applicant's recitations of claims by not disclosing identical ranges. However, the reference discloses "overlapping" ranges, and overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness (MPEP 2144.05).

Regarding claims 25-26, Du Bourg et al. disclose the composition comprising saccharide [0075].

Regarding claims 27-29, Du Bourg et al. the composition at a temperature of 25 °C (examples)

Regarding claims 30-33 and 36-41, Du Bourg et al.. disclose that the composition can be used in paper making process ([0113]). It is to be noted that claims 31-33 and 36-41 are defining the intended use of the additive and this intended use adds no patentable weight to the additive, *per se*, and thus the additive is rejectable under its own merits and not dependent on the use thereof.

Regarding claims 34-35, Du Bourg et al. disclose that the composition can be diluted by distilled water ([0058]) and this would clearly include any and all dilution rates as long as the defined additive is formed. Thus, it is the examiners position that the above dilution rates would include any and all rates, including the claimed ones absent specific evidence of criticality. In addition, depending on the viscosity of the additive for a specific application (i.e. paper making as defined by the reference), one skilled in the art would have found the optimal dilution rates through routine experimentation and optimization and said rates would have proved to be within the claimed range absent evidence to the contrary.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The BE 626712 reference cited on the 1449 has not been considered because no English abstract or English langue equivalent has been submitted

The documents listed in the "other documents" section of the 1449 have not been considered because applicants have failed to provide the office with a copy of these references and the corresponding English abstract or English language equivalent.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHUANGYI ABU ALI whose telephone number is (571)272-6453. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SA

/Michael A Marcheschi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793